

boy! Now we say plumply, that this sort of sentimentality is downright humbug of the worst kind. It is humbug, because there is nothing particularly precious or dignified in our skins; and of the worst kind, because it seeks to destroy the discipline of the schools, where, of all places, discipline is most needed. The degradation in whipping does not consist in its being put on the body, but that it is punishment. Punishment is degrading. It must be, and it ought to be. How can you escape from punishment in discipline? You can not, and these pseudo-philanthropists don't pretend to. They only say, you must punish in some other way. *What way is more efficient?* Here comes in the discretion of the teacher. For it depends on the age of the pupil, in some measure on his temperament, and on the circumstance of the case, whether the rod is really the best mode of punishment. In general, the youngest children are the most amenable to the rod; for they have the least reason. We use animal punishments (as we should define them) where the reason, which makes man intelligent and superior to mere animals, is not developed. We heard an aged and intelligent lady say, that when a child is old enough to show a temper, it is old enough to be whipped. This will be called by the sentimentalists, cruel; but never was anything said more true. It is the failure of mothers to begin the discipline of children early, that gives teachers, society, and the world such infinite trouble afterwards. The same thing may be said of the youngest children in schools. Children begin to come to school at five years of age, and from that to ten they are little sensible to any other motives than those which affect their bodily feelings. They can not reason clearly on moral considerations, and they are too young for much ambition. Hence, we see parents and teachers also invent many sorts of minor punishments; but almost the whole of them appeal to the bodily sensations. The parent puts the child in a dark closet, or sends it to bed without supper, or whips it if he thinks that best. The end is the same, and that end will remain, whatever variation there may be in the punishment. Teachers have not so many resources as in the household; and for young children, a good whipping is the quickest, cheapest, and oftentimes the very best mode of punishment. It is no more likely to fail than any other kind of punishment; and yet we admit at once, that there may be boys to whom such a punishment is not suitable. This is particularly the case with the older boys. We once saw a teacher, where we went to school, tie up a boy to a post in the room, and give him a cowhiding. It did no good, but, on the contrary, it did harm. The boy was of a cold, obstinate temperament, and his sensibilities were blunted by his own bad conduct and repeated whippings. In such a case, the boy ought either to be discharged at once, or only moral influence affecting the heart be used. He was in a condition in which only absolute conversion of the heart would do any good. But the teacher was not the man to see this, nor the man to use the kindly influence of the friend, if he had seen it.

We do not affirm that universal whipping is necessary—we do not affirm that the body is the best avenue to the mind; but we do affirm two fundamental principles of education. We affirm that discipline is the first and greatest element of education. It is to education what delivery, as described by Demosthenes, is to the orator. Delivery—delivery—delivery! is the essential element of oratory, and so is discipline—discipline—discipline—to education. We affirm again, that to the success of discipline, it is essential that the teacher should be allowed a discretion in his modes of punishment. We do not believe any teacher who is fit to be a teacher on earth, ever whipped children because he wanted to; for to none but an unnatural being, could whipping children be a pleasure. But we say that there is nothing in our modern experience to reverse the doctrine of the ancients, that he who spareth the rod, spoileth his child. We look for that better time, when human nature will be softened by the dews of heavenly grace, and human punishments cease, because no longer needed; but till then, we shall be incredulous of any system which professes to do without the discipline of the body, the mind, or the heart.—*Ohio Educational Monthly.*

5. LEGAL DECISION ON THE MATTER IN OHIO.

A school-whipping case was recently tried in the Court of Common Pleas at Ashland county, Wm. Osborn, Judge. The evidence showed that the whipping was severe, but administered with ordinary switches, and discontinued the moment the boy yielded. The charge of the Judge was to the effect that the right of a teacher to inflict corporeal punishment on a pupil was well settled in law, and that the mere excess of punishment did not render the teacher criminally liable unless the evidence showed (1) that the instrument was improper; (2) that permanent disability was caused; (3) that the punishment was inflicted in anger, or in hatred or in ill will; or (4) that the punishment was violent or cruel. The verdict, "Not guilty," was returned by the jury. "The decision," says the *Ashland Times*, "was a righteous one, and had it been otherwise we would give little for the discipline of the schools of our country."

6. EXPERIENCE OF A PARENT IN OHIO.

A "Parent" in the Zanesville (O.) *Courier* gives some of the results of the non-whipping system of the School Board in that place: 1. The order and scholarship have deteriorated more than twenty-five per cent. under the Board's new-fangled experiment—so say a large majority of the teachers, and so say a majority of the parents. 2. It has caused a considerable number of children to be turned out of the school. Those children mostly belong to the class for whom "free schools" were created. Any boy who prefers playing in the streets to going to school, has only to take advantage of this beautiful "rule," and get dismissed from the school. One of our old and honorable citizens informs me that his business for many years has required him almost daily to meet the pupils of one of the ward schools as they leave the school-room, noons and evenings, and that until within a few months past he was never treated uncivilly by them. They have now become so impudent and so rude to him that he avoids as much as possible meeting them. A few days since he threatened to report them to their teachers for their rudeness, and was answered with an oath: "they don't dare to touch us."

7. OBJECTORS ANSWERED.

J. C. K., in the *Religious Monthly Magazine* for March, defends the practice of corporeal punishment against two classes of objectors: those who disapprove only the infliction of bodily castigation, and those who hold to the efficiency of kindness and moral suasion.

To the first class, who argue "that corporeal punishment is degrading to the spirit," and that it inflicts a physical injury, he replies that all punishment is degrading and attended with pain; but that the disgrace lies not in the discipline, but in its connection with wrong doing—a very important distinction. He then shows conclusively that if injury is to be inflicted, whipping is a far less serious evil, because merely an external infliction, than the inward torture to which a sensitive nature is subjected by dishonorable demerits and cutting satire.

To the second class, who argue that all punishment is barbaric, and that moral and civilized beings require merely enlightenment and moral suasion, he replies that, in most cases, the course recommended is an impossibility, for the very act of singling out a child for the exercise of moral suasion is a degradation in the eyes of the child and his companions. As for the moral suasion, that implies the knowledge of right and wrong which comes in a large part from the experience of their fruit—pain from sin and joy from virtue—and if a child has no experience of pain as connected with wrong doing he can never get the hatred for it which will make it susceptible of being used as a motive.

He claims that the true philosophy of punishment as a means of discipline has for its object the awakening of the moral perceptions and connecting the "idea of wrong with pain, harshness, and degradation." When this has been done, and the idea of wrong is so associated with suffering, and right so wedded to pleasant emotions, "that, if the two courses are presented to the mind, love for the one and hatred to the other will instinctively rise with them," we have the real basis of moral suasion, which may then take the place of punishment.

Sin is a moral disease which must be cured however bitter the medicine, and where offences are committed there ought to be no shrinking. "Moral health is the thing to be gained at all costs. And though from our earthly the same as our Heavenly parent, all chastening seemeth for the present to be grievous, yet afterwards it yieldeth the peaceful fruits of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby."

8. AN OPPOSITE VIEW.

A writer in the *Iowa Instructor* argues that a discipline can be substituted for the rod, which will answer a better purpose, and that teachers should discard the use of the rod in the school room. He states that neither the reformation of the offender, nor a salutary influence on the spectators is gained by whipping and thus concludes:—

"But even if this method accomplished all that its advocates claim for it, we would still argue for its discontinuance. It is unnecessary. The fact that many of our best teachers are able to conduct schools successfully without it proves this point, as it also proves that those who cannot govern without a resort to the rod, are deficient in at least one of the essentials of a good teacher. We claim then that there is no case, where a proper course is pursued by the teacher, in which kindness will fail to secure good discipline in the school, without resort being had to this mode of punishment. Can any teacher cite a single case where kindness—not pretended but real—has failed to win respect and obedience from the pupil? We speak of kindness, not in a sense which conveys the idea of indulgence and partiality, but of that kindness which shows itself in attempts to benefit the pupil, which makes him feel that you have